BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE MATTER OF 3 EDHONDS-STEVENS, INC., 4 Appellant, PCHB No. 379 5 Vs. FINDINGS OF FACT, 6 CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY, 7 8 Respondent. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

A formal hearing on the appeal of Edmonds-Stevens, Inc. to a Notice of Civil Penalty of \$50.00 for an alleged smoke emission violation came on before Board members W. A. Gissberg and Mary Ellen McCaffree, W. A. Gissberg presiding, on October 12, 1973, in Seattle, Washington.

Appellant appeared by and through its secretary, Richard Johnson; respondent appeared by and through its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin.

17 Eaving heard the testimony and reviewed the exhibits and being fully 18 advised the Board makes the following

| FINDINGS C |)F | FAC | ľ |
|------------|----|-----|---|
|------------|----|-----|---|

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

 $2 \div$ 25

26

FINDINGS OF FACT. CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER I.

On May 4, 1973, appellant caused or allowed exhaust, or smoke, to be emitted from a Diesel powered pile driver which appellant was operating near Evergreen Park, Kitsap County, Washington, for five consecutive minutes of a shade darker than Number 2 on the Ringelmann Chart, namely a Ringelmann number three and one-half.

II.

The pile driving equipment was not owned by appellant but rather had been leased by it.

III.

Section 9.03(a) of respondent's Regulation I makes it unlawful to cause or allow the emission of an air contaminant darker in shade than Number 2 on the Ringelmann Chart for more than three minutes in any hour.

IV.

Appellant contends that it should not be subjected to respondent's Notice of Civil Penalty No. 839 because it was not the owner but the renter of the equipment which caused the emission.

From which comes these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

Appellant was in violation of Section 9.03(a) of respondent's Regulation I.

II.

The civil penalty, being one-fifth of the maximum allowed is

reasonable. III. It is not a defense to appellant that it was operating leased equipment any more than the operator of a vehicle which was violating the speeding laws of this state could contend that he was not guilty of a violation of law because the vehicle which he was operating was rented. From which follows the Board's ORDER The appeal is denied and the civil penalty is affirmed. DATED this 23 day of October , 1973. POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD FINDINGS OF FACT,

~ F % A 5074.

CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER